

**REMARKS**

Claims 2, 5, 6 and 25 are presently pending in the application. Claims 7-24 have been previously withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention and have now been canceled, in addition to Claims 1, 3 and 4. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Ito et al. in view of Nishikawa et al. and Milewski et al. Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. For the following reasons, the prior art rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant respectfully submits that neither the individual nor the combination of the Ito et al., Nishikawa et al., and Milewski et al. references teaches or suggests a semiconductor apparatus including a plurality of solder bumps forming spaces therebetween; a resin film disposed on the semiconductor chip and the solder bumps, the resin film being disposed in the spaces between solder bumps such that upper surfaces of the solder bumps protrude from the resin layer; a eutectic solder layer disposed on the cleaned upper surfaces of the solder bumps; a mounting board; a plurality of lands formed on the mounting board and aligned opposite the solder bumps; and a precoated solder layer disposed on the lands; wherein the eutectic solder layer of the solder bumps and the precoated solder layer join the upper surfaces of the solder bumps to the lands of the mounting board such that a stacked structure is obtained; wherein a gap is formed between the resin layer and the mounting board of the stacked structure, as recited in amended Claim 25.

Rather, although Fig. 28 shows a gap H between the resin layer 10 and the semiconductor element 3, the final stacked structure is flattened such that the electrode portions 2 are flattened similar to that shown in Fig. 20 (see col. 42, lines 12-21).

Accordingly, the present invention is not obvious over either the individual or the combination of the Ito et al., Nishikawa et al. and Milewski et al. references, and the rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Further, since Claims 2, 5, and 6 depend from Claim 25, they are also patentably distinguishable over the applied prior art for the reasons cited above with respect to Claim 25.

If the Examiner believes that there is any issue which could be resolved by a telephone or personal interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such an extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,



Jean C. Edwards

Registration No. 41,728

Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
**Telephone: 312/876-2891**  
**Facsimile: 312/876-7457**  
**Date: September 2, 2003**

14335555/V1